

Date: Mon, 1 Feb 93 04:30:13 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #28  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                  Mon, 1 Feb 93                  Volume 93 : Issue 28

Today's Topics:

    Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

---

Date: 31 Jan 93 08:03:57 -0700  
From: sdd.hp.com!nigel.msen.com!fmsrl7!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!mala.bc.ca!  
wagner@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C1nFn3.C4G@iat.holonet.net>, bwilkins@iat.holonet.net (Bob Wilkins  
n6fri) writes:

> rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Rod Anderson) writes:  
> : The basic issue on the open-closed repeater discussion is not if a  
> : person can limit the use of their repeater but can an individual  
> : or organization OWN frequencies and prevent others from using  
> : frequencies in the ham bands.  
>  
> The coordinated repeater has rights to a coverage area as shown in the  
> part 97. The uncoordinated repeater or auxiliary station is secondary and  
> must bear the burden of correcting any interference to the coordinated  
> repeater. Any one may use the frequencies by agreement. This applies to  
> open or closed repeaters.  
> :  
> : If repeaters shared frequencies or any one could put up an open  
> : repeater on any frequency there would be no problem. But when

[B> : there are no open repeaters and no more frequency pairs for  
> : additional repeaters, and the closed repeaters in the area are  
> : charging \$300 a year isn't this the same as charging for the use  
> : of the ham band?  
>  
> I have never heard of an area with no open repeaters. Even in SoCal there  
> are uhf frequencies filled with open repeaters. There are "open repeaters"  
> listed as closed sharing the frequencies with closed repeaters.  
>  
> Some areas of the country have frequencies known as shared non protected.  
> This type of operation is more in tune with your proposal. Repeaters come  
> and go quite regularly on these frequencies. Lots of kids playing, lots of  
> experimental type, low budget operations. Lots of fun. These frequencies  
> are as close to anarchy as the crowding allows.  
>  
> I wish that there were 256 shades of gray between open and closed. The  
> ARRL only sees fit to distinguish between two states..open and closed.  
>  
> How about it...Really ..how many kinds of repeaters are there?  
>  
> open.club.networked.linked.private.packet.autopatch.remote.control.closed  
>  
> ;> bob n6fri  
>  
> [B--  
> Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area  
> bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ w6pw.#nocal.ca.usa.na  
>  
-- As usual, we up here in VE7 land are doing it up brown. Our repeater co-  
ordination group here wants all repeaters closed.

Won't pass comments on this one, but a friend from Texas was most impressed  
by the access to repeaters and the the amount of free air availaable on them.

Guess if they close them there will be even more free air (not free air time).  
Personally except for auto patch use I feel repeaters should be open. A PL  
tone for autopatch does keep idiots from trying to pirate tones and use.

73, Tom

=====

Tom Wagner, Audio Visual Technician. Malaspina College Nanaimo British Columbia  
(604) 753-3245, Local 2226 Fax (604) 755-8742 Callsign VE7GDA

I do not recyle..... I keep everything! (All standard disclaimers apply)

=====

-----

Date: Sun, 31 Jan 1993 14:29:45 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!paladin.american.edu!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!  
gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Pine.3.04.9301271136.A12343-b100000@pennsy.med.jhu.edu>, <1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com>, <1993Jan30.160622.4612@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: Net Control Signing for others on Net

In article <1993Jan30.160622.4612@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>  
jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (John E. Gefaell) writes:  
>In article <1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Michael  
P. Deignan) writes:  
>>I always say:  
>>  
>><net-related stuff....> Back to net-control. KD1HZ.  
>>  
>>at the end of each of my net transmissions.  
>  
>That is poor procedure, and you should discontinue it. The regulations  
>require you to sign your assigned callsign ONCE every ten minutes and  
>at the termination of communications.  
>  
>Instead, stations should use 'tactical' callsigns in nets. These are  
>portable (station operators can relieve or replace each other in the  
>field) indicate relevance in the operation at hand ('rest 1' clearly  
>lets me as Net Control know that this transmission is coming from  
>such and such place on my map) and should not require phonetic  
>clarification under any circumstances.  
>  
>As Net Control, I identify every ten minutes, and this is a good time  
>for other stations to ID and satisfy Part 97 regulations. I \*NEVER\*  
>respond to a transmission like 'KD4CQY' Since it is clearly a Part 97  
>compliance. However a transmission like 'Police 1' indicates the desire  
>of that station to be scheduled for response by Net Control. There may  
>be other stations with important traffic, on 'simplex' nets other stations  
>may not know that there is traffic being handled. The use of extremely  
>brief transmissions is critical. There is no need to say 'This is Police  
>Car 1 calling Net Control' (SHEESH!) when 'Police1' will certainly suffice.  
>  
>Thus repeated identification is not only unnecessary and silly, it is also  
>detrimental to the net.

Net ID pileups may be within the letter of the law, but they certainly  
don't satisfy the spirit of the law. Multiple doubling to satisfy the  
ID requirement is horrible practice. The practice followed on traffic

nets, club nets, and other \*directed\* nets is as outlined by Michael, a single callsign at the end of transmission. That's because it may be more than 10 minutes before you are called upon to transmit again, if you are called upon again at all. Formal net practice may not be suited to tactical emergency nets, but then the FCC is sometimes less upset about ID timing and readability in real emergency situations.

When I was running the Kentucky Traffic Net, we often had upwards of 100 stations checking in, Vietnam War era, and stations without traffic for the net who were present to accept traffic often only got \*one\* transmission during the net unless there was traffic for their service area. In a two hour net session, the last thing we needed was 100 stations yelling their callsign every 10 minutes.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: 1 Feb 1993 01:45:22 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com>,  
<1993Jan30.160622.4612@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>,  
<1993Jan31.142945.21642@ke4zv.uucp>  
Subject : Re: Net Control Signing for others on Net

When we were designing an early packet radio protocol (pre-AX.25) that was to use central-site polling, one of the bandwidth-saving techniques we used was to send a single "ID-now" poll packet, and any station that had transmitted within the previous 10 minutes was to send its ID in Morse (required then) at that moment. That fully complied with the regulations as we understood them.

We felt that it was the FCC's problem to figure out which station was which. I still do.

- Brian

-----

Date: Mon, 1 Feb 1993 05:18:27 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!concert!  
uncsun.uncc.edu!wlhamaty@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan27.090717.2148@guvax.acc.georgetown.edu>, <1993Jan28.211130.16685@nntp2.cxo.dec.com>, <1993Jan29.233654.29325@newshost.lanl.gov>

Subject : Re: My call sign : (

In article <1993Jan29.233654.29325@newshost.lanl.gov> tjf@beta.lanl.gov (Tom J Farish) writes:

>By the way, the operator privileges listing  
>is just "technician"...no indication that I  
>did in fact pass the 5 WPM test. Do I have  
>to keep my certificate of completion with the  
>license is there no distinction on the license  
>itself? I passed the written and code tests  
>the same session.

Yes, you do have to keep the CSCE indefinitely, or at least until you get your General.

Congratulations and enjoy! What is the callsign?

73 de KD4HSE

--  
[-----]  
| Luke Hamaty KD4HSE "More than gold, I love to complain."  
| Impact Technologies Group - Trurl, from The Cyberiad  
|  
| 800-438-6017 I'm a grad student too - but I plead temporary insanity.  
|  
-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #28

\*\*\*\*\*